

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-15, 17, 18 and 20 were examined in the outstanding office action mailed on 04/10/2006 (hereafter "Outstanding Office Action"). Applicants note with appreciation that claim 7 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent format. The remaining presented claims were rejected.

By virtue of this response, claims 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, 18 and 20 sought to be amended, and new claims 21-24 are sought to be added. The amendments and additions are believed not to introduce new subject matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The amendments and cancellations are made without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-15, 17, 18, and 20-24 are thus respectfully presented for reconsideration.

Examiner Interview

As noted above, a telephone interview was conducted with Examiner Hartman on July 6, 2006. Only the undersigned representative and Examiner Hartman were present at the interview. The undersigned representative explained Figures 1 and 3 of the subject patent application, and also reviewed previously presented claims 1 and 2. In addition, the applicant clarified what was meant by "to cover the entire communication path ..." in claim 4, and is also repeated in the section below.

Agreement appears to have been reached that previously presented claim 2 is allowable over the art of record. The Examiner also appears to have agreed to reconsider the rejection of claim 1. Applicants and the undersigned representative thank the Examiner for the same.

The applicant is believed to have met the burden of making of record the Substance of the Interview/email communications. See MPEP 713.04 for further clarification.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 was objected to noting that the term "said wire-based medium" in line 25 lacks proper antecedent basis, and suggesting that the terms "to a second device" be changed to "to a second field device". Claim 1 has been amended to address both the objections, and withdrawal of the objections with respect to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 has been objected to requesting clarification on what was meant by the term "to cover the entire communication path ...". As was explained in the telephone interview with the Examiner, the term refers to a configuration in which the path between the FDMS and the first client system is wireless, without wire-based network between. Withdrawal of the rejection with respect to claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-15, 17-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oberg et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061295. As noted in the telephone interview, Oberg does not appear to teach or reasonably suggest the combination of features of claim 1 noted below:

Claim 1 (Currently Amended): A method of enabling an operator to remotely manage a plurality of field devices designed to implement a process in a plant, said plant further containing a field device management station (FDMS) coupled to said plurality of field devices by a control network, wherein ***said FDMS is designed to issue a plurality of commands to each of said plurality of field devices on said control network***, said method comprising:

providing a wireless connection from a first client, wherein ***said wireless connection provides communication between said first client and said FDMS***;

enabling said operator to issue a first command from said first client to a first field device contained in said plurality of field devices, wherein said first command is contained in said plurality of commands;

transferring an indication from said first client to said FDMS on said wireless connection in response to said first command being issued by said operator, said indication indicating that said operator has issued said first command from said first client;

forwarding said first command from said FDMS to said first field device on said control network in response to receiving said indication,

whereby *said operator manages said plurality of field devices using said first client based on said wireless connection,*
providing *a wire-based connection between a second client and said FDMS;*

5 enabling said operator to issue an another command from said second client, said another command being directed to a second field device contained in said plurality of field devices;

10 *transferring an another indication from said second client to said FDMS on said wire-based connection medium upon said user issuing said another command;* and

forwarding said another command from said FDMS to said second field device on said control network upon receiving said another indication,

whereby commands from said first client and said second client are channeled through said FDMS.

15 (Currently Amended Claim 1, *Emphasis Added*).

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the art of record.

Amended independent claim 2 recites in relevant parts:

...

20 connecting said first client to said second field device contained in said plurality of field devices;

transferring a second command from said FDMS to said first client using said wireless connection, wherein said second command is directed to said second field device; and

25 sending said second command from said first client to said second field device, whereby *said second command is forwarded from said FDMS to said second field device without using said control network.*

(Currently Amended Independent Claim 2, *Emphasis Added*).

30 Such a feature of the ability to send commands to a field with and without using a control network is not taught or reasonably suggested by the art of record. Claim 2 is accordingly believed to be in condition for allowance over the art of record.

The remaining independent claims presented for consideration are also allowable at least for one or more of the reasons noted above. The dependent claims are allowable at least as depending from allowable base claims.

Claim 4 is independently allowable in reciting that, "said wireless connection is provided to cover the entire communication path between said FDMS and said first client".

5 All the objections and rejections are thus believed to be overcome and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance over the art of record. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at 707.356.4172 if it is believed that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

/Narendra Reddy Thappeta/

Signature

Date: July 10, 2006

Printed Name: Narendra Reddy Thappeta

Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number: 41,416